REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants thank Examiner Bruenjes for withdrawing the §112 rejections and the §102 and §103 rejections mentioned at paragraphs 2-4 on page 2 of the Official Action. Applicants kindly submit that the remaining rejections should also be withdrawn.

The anticipation and obviousness rejections over the Ageheim et al. are obviated by amendment. The claims now require that the barrier resin has a Fedors' solubility parameter greater than 11. Applicants submit herewith an Information Disclosure Statement with the Fedors' article, which discusses the solubility parameter.

In contrast to the present invention, the Ageheim et al. disclosure teaches a layered material in which the barrier layer is *compatible* with the substrate layer. As noted at the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 of Ageheim et al., "a barrier layer... [is] compatible with both the polyethene and the hydrocarbons which are to be transported or stored." The reason that Ageheim et al.'s barrier layer must be compatible with the polyethene layer is that the reference discloses only co-extrusion of the two layers and, in order to obtain good interlayer adhesion between these two layers, they must be compatible. Applicants point this out at page 54, second paragraph: "therefore, the resin affinity between EVOH and high-density polyethylene is low, and in [the] case where the two resins are laminated, they could not enjoy good interlayer adhesion therebetween. For example, in [the] case where EVOH and high-density polyethylene are laminated through co-extrusion, they are generally adhered to each other via an adhesive resin therebetween for preventing interlayer peeling." In contrast to Ageheim et al., wherein the layers must be compatible with one another, in the present invention the inventors have found that good interlayer adhesion can be obtained between incompatible resin layers without the use of an adhesive layer if the barrier material (B) is applied to the polyolefin (A) surface with at least one method selected from the group consisting of flame spray coating, rotational molding, fluidized bed coating, and electrostatic

coating. See, e.g., the discussion at page 55, lines 6ff. To clarify the incompatibility between the layers in the invention more clear, the claims now require that the barrier resin has a Fedors' solubility parameter of larger than 11. Neither the present invention nor its advantages are suggested by the Ageheim et al. reference. The present invention is neither anticipated nor made obvious by the teachings of Ageheim et al. alone, and withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is kindly requested.

The addition of Hata et al. and Kido does not cure the deficiencies of Ageheim et al. Hata et al. and Kido are cited against various dependent claims, but they do not cure the deficiency of Ageheim et al. respecting the broad claims. These rejections should be withdrawn as unsustainable.

For all the reasons given above, and in view of the claim amendments, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early and favorable indication of same is kindly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Norman F. Oblon

Customer Number
22850

Attorney of Record